DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 271 CG 023 425

AUTHOR Buri, John R.; And Others
TITLE Toxic Familial Effects of Parental Hostility.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (63rd, Chicago, IL, May 2-4, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; College Students; Fathers; Higher Education; *Hostility; Mothers; *Parent Child Relationship; *Self Esteem; *Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

In research efforts to account for the variance in parent-child interactions, two variables have been cited repeatedly for their explanatory cogency--nurturance and authority. This study was conducted to examine the relation of parents' Hostility (Ho) scores from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-based Cook and Medley Hostility Scale to older adolescents' phenomenological assessments of their parents' nurturance and authority and the relation of scores to the adolescents' self-esteem. College students (N=85) completed six questionnaires: a global self-esteem scale, a mother's nurturance scale, a father's nurturance scale, a mother's authority questionnaire, a father's authority questionnaire, and a demographic information sheet. Mothers and fathers of the students completed the Hostility Scale. Several inverse relationships were found between Ho scores and adolescent self-esteem and adolescent perception of their parental nurturance and authority. The magnitude of these effects was consistently greater for fathers' Ho than for mothers' Ho, adding support to the hypothesis that the behavioral and emotional consequences of Ho are different for men and women. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Toxic Familial Effects of Parental Hostility

John R. Buri and Ann M. Cooper

University of St. Thomas

Lynda M. Richtsmeier

University of North Carolina

Karen K. Komar

University of Arizona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John R. Buri
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED333327

CG023425

Abstract: *The Cook and Medley (1954) hostility (Ho) Scale was used to investigate the relation of mothers' and fathers' Ho to their adolescents' assessments of their parental nurturance and authority. The relation of Ho to adolescent self-esteem was also investigated. Several inverse relationships between Ho and these variables were found. Furthermore, the magnitude of these effects were consistently greater for fathers' Ho than for mothers' Ho, thus providing further evidence that the behavioral and emotional consequences of Ho are different for men and women.*

Studies employing the MMPI-based Cook and Medley (1954) Hostility (Ho) Scale have implicated hostility in cardiovascular health problems in men (e.g., Barefoot, Dahlstrom, & Williams, 1983; Shekelle, Gale, Ostfeld, & Paul, 1983; Williams, Haney, Lee, Kong, Blumenthal, & Whalen, 1980) as well as in general mortality rates among men (e.g., Barefoot et al., 1983; Barefoot, Dodge, Peterson, Dahlstrom, & Williams, 1989; Shekelle et al., 1983). Furthermore, high Ho men (when compared to low Ho men) have been found to display greater levels of anger, irritation, and cardiovascualr arousal when placed in circumstances involving interpersonal confrontation (e.g., Hardy & Smith, 1988;

Correspndence concerning this article should be sent to Dr. John R. Buri, Department of Psychology, Mail #4026, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN 55105.

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Smith & Allred, 1989; Suarez & Williams, 1989). Recently Smith, Sanders, and Alexander (1990) extended our empirical understanding of the toxic effects of hostility to the interpersonal relationships found in marriage. They reported that when placed in a high-conflict situation with their wives, high Ho men experienced greater anger and overt hostile behavior than did low Ho men; furthermore, the high Ho men were more apt to blame their wives for their disagreements. High Ho wives in the same high-conflict situation, however, were not found to differ from low Ho wives in anger or blame, and there was only a small (albeit significant) increase in the hostile behavior for these high Ho women.

Taken together these findings suggest that hostility may be a robust psychological disposition with pervasive deleterious effects upon health, anger, aggressive behavior, and interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, there is some evidence that the toxic effects of this hostility are particularly pronounced in men. With this in mind, the present study was undertaken to investigate the relation of hostility to an important area of emotional and behavioral functioning --- parenting.

In research efforts to account for the variance in parent-child interactions, two variables have repeatedly been cited for their explanatory cogency --- nurturance and authority (for reviews of this research, see Martin, 1975; Rohner, 1986; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). In our study we were interested in the relation of parents' Ho scores to older adolescents' phenomenological assessments of their parents' nurturance and authority. Furthermore, given the established relationship between adolescent self-esteem and parental nurturance (e.g., Bachman, 1982; Buri, Kirchner, & Walsh, 1987;

Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas, 1971; Hoelter & Harper, 1987; Rosenberg, 1979) as well as that between self-esteem and parental authority (e.g., Buri, Louiselle, Misukanis, & Mueller, 1988; Coopersmith, 1967; Gecas & Schwalbe, 1986; Peterson, Southworth, & Peters, 1983; Sears, 1970), we were also interested in the relation of parents' Ho scores to their adolescents' self-esteem.

Several specific hypotheses have been generated. Reid and Patterson (1984) reported on the undermining effects of irritability and aggressive responding upon parental effectiveness; similarly, Maccoby (1980) related behavioral measures of hostility to less effective parenting. Therefore, our first hypothesis is that high Ho scores by both fathers and mothers are associated with less effective nurturance and authority. Furthermore, given the findings reported by Smith et al. (1990) that increased anger and hostile behavior were observed in high Ho men (but not high Ho women) when faced with interpersonal conflict, we are hypothesizing that these effects are stronger for fathers' Ho than for mothers' Ho. Another hypothesis derives from the findings reported by Coopersmith (1967) and Bachman (1982) that parental behavioral aggressiveness and adolescent self-esteem are inversely related. Specifically it is hypothesized that there is an inverse relationship between Ho and self-esteem; and again, we are anticipating that this relationship is stronger for fathers' Ho than for mothers' Ho. A further hypothesis has been suggested by the findings of Smith et al. (1990) that couples in which both individuals were low in Ho created especially beneficent interactional patterns. Based upon these findings, we are proposing that adolescent levels of self-esteem are especially high in those situations where both fathers' and mothers' Ho scores are low. Finally, we were interested in the exploratory

investigation of the relation of Barefoot et al.'s (1989) specific Ho subset factors to parental nurturance, parental authority, and adolescent self-esteem.

Method

Subjects

The participation of 156 college students (as part of an introductory psychology course requirement) and both their parents (through mailed questionnaires) was requested. The responses of 34 students were eliminated from the present analyses because their parents were divorced or separated. An additional four subjects were excluded from the study because of incomplete or inadequate participation. Finally, 33 students were eliminated because at least one of their parents declined the opportunity to participate. The remaining 85 students from intact families (38 females, 47 males; mean age = 19.1 years) and both their parents participated through questionnaire responses.

Materials and Procedure

Each college-age participant completed six questionnaires which were presented in randomized order: (a) a global self-esteem scale, (b) a mothers' nurturance scale, (c) a fathers' nurturance scale, (d) a mothers' authority questionnaire, (e) a fathers' authority questionnaire, and (f) a demographic information sheet. Each parent was asked to complete the Cook and Medley (1954) Ho Scale.

Each of the research participants was told that we were investigating factors that are believed to influence self-esteem in adolescents. They were instructed that there were no right or wrong answers and that all of their responses were anonymous; therefore they were encouraged to respond to each item as honestly as possible. They were also instructed not to spend too much

time on any one item since we were interested in their first reaction to each statement. They were also reminded of the importance of responding to every item on the questionnaires.

Global self-esteem. Each of the college students completed the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965). The Total Positive self-esteem score was derived for each subject. As operationalized by Fitts,

> persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful about their own worth; see themselves as undesirable; ...and have little faith or confidence in themselves (p. 2).

Based upon a standardization sample of 626 people, Fitts reported a test-retest reliability for the Total Positive self-esteem score of r = .92.

Parental nurturance. Concepts and items related to parental nurturance were derived from several sources (e.g., Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Gecas, 1969; Schaefer & Bell, 1958; Straus & Brown, 1978) and were used to construct the 24-item Parental Nurturance Scale (PNS; Buri, 1989). Individuals completing the PNS are asked to respond to each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), and each item is stated from the point of view of an individual evaluating the parental nurturance he or she has received.

Two forms of this questionnaire were employed in the present study, one to measure the degree of mothers' nurturance and one to measure the degree of fathers' nurturance. Test-retest reliabilities based upon the responses of 85 college students over a two-week interval were r = .92 for Mothers'

Nurturance and r = .94 for Fathers' Nurturance. Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha values were .95 for Mothers' Nurturance and .93 for Fathers' Nurturance (N = 156 college students).

Examples of items from the PNS are: "My mother/father enjoys spending time with me," "I feel that my mother/father finds fault with me more often than I deserve," and "I am an important person in my mother's/father's eyes."

Parental authority. Distinctions proposed by Baumrind (1971) for three prototypes of parental authority (i.e., permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative) were employed by Buri (1991) to construct the Parental Authority Questinnaire (PAQ). The PAQ consists of 10 permissive, 10 authoritarian, and 10 authoritative Likert-type items stated from the point of view of an individual appraising the authority exercised by his or her mother and father. Test-retest studies of the PAQ based upon the responses of 61 college students over a two-week interval yielded the following reliabilities: r = .81 for Mothers' Permissiveness, r = .86 for Mothers' Authoritarianism, r = .78 for Mothers' Authoritativeness, r = .77 for Fathers' Permissiveness, r = .85 for Fathers' Authoritarianism, and r = .92 for Fathers' Authoritativeness. Responses of 185 college students to the PAQ yielded the following Cronbach alpha values: .75 for Mothers' Permissiveness, .85 for Mothers' Authoritarianism, .82 for Mothers' Authoritativeness, .74 for Fathers' Permissiveness, .87 for Fathers' Authoritarianism, and .85 for Fathers' Authoritativeness.

Each college-age participant completed two forms of the PAQ, one to evaluate the authority exercised by the mother and one to evaluate the authority of the father. Examples of items from the permissive scale are: "My mother/father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own

minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want," and "As I was growing up my mother/father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her/him." Examples of items from the authoritarianism scale are: "As I was growing up my mother/father did not allow me to question any decision that she/he had made," and "My mother/father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to." Examples from the authoritative scale are: "My mother/father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable," and "My mother/father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she/he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of individual children in the family."

Demographic information. The student participants also provided information concerning (a) their gender, (b) their age, (c) whether one of their parents had died, and (d) whether their parents were divorced or separated.

Hostility. Copies of the Ho Scale (Cook & Medley, 1954) were mailed home to each of the parents along with a letter explaining the research project and soliciting their participation. A stamped envelope for convenience in returning the completed questionnaires was also included with the questionnaires and the letter.

The Ho Scale consists of 50 items from the MMPI. This scale was originally constructed to discriminate teacher rapport with students. Cook and Medley reported an internal consistency of .86. More recently, Smith and Frohm (1985) reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .82. Test-retest reli-

abilities reported by Barefoot et al. (1983) and Shekelle et al. (1983) were both approximately $r = .85$.

In an attempt to better understand the construct measured by the Ho Scale, Barefoot et al. (1989) subjected the Ho items to analyses of the item content by several judges. These a priori classifications resulted in six item subsets: Cynicism, Hostile Attributions, Hostile Affect, Aggressive Responding, Social Avoidance, and Other. Barefoot et al. presented evidence suggesting that the Social Avoidance and Other categories are likely measuring constructs other than hostility; therefore only the Cynicism, Hostile Attributions, Hostile Affect, and Aggressive Responding factors (along with the total Ho score) were used in the present analyses.

Results

Simple regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses that (a) high Ho scores are predictive of less effective parental nurturance and authority, and that (b) these effects are stronger for fathers' Ho then for mothers' Ho. The Ho item subsets were also designated as predictor variables and were regressed against the nurturance and authority variables. Summaries of these regression analyses are presented in Table 1 for the mothers' data and Table 2 for the fathers' data.

As indicated in Table 1, Ho and the Ho subset factors were predictive for mothers only in the case of Authoritativeness: marginally significant relationships between Mothers' Authoritativeness and (a) Mothers' Ho [$F = 3.99$, $p < .05$], (b) Mothers' Cynicism [$F = 3.66$, $p < .06$], and (c) Mothers' Aggressive Responding [$F = 4.16$, $p < .05$] were obtained. For the fathers' data, however (Table 2), Fathers' Ho was predictive of Permissiveness [$F = 3.21$, $p < .08$], Authoritari-

Table 1

Summary of Simple Regressions for Mothers' Data of Nurturance, Permissiveness, Authoritarianism, and Authoritativeness on Ho and the Ho Subset Factors

Independent variables	Dependent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	r^2	r
	Nurturance				
Ho		0.52	*ns*	.006	-.08
Cynicism		0.81	*ns*	.010	-.10
Hostile Attributions		0.63	*ns*	.007	-.09
Hostile Affect		1.14	*ns*	.014	-.12
Aggressive Responding		1.61	*ns*	.019	-.14
	Permissiveness				
Ho		0.06	*ns*	.001	-.03
Cynicism		0.07	*ns*	.001	.03
Hostile Attributions		0.89	*ns*	.011	-.10
Hostile Affect		0.06	*ns*	.001	-.03
Aggressive Responding		0.58	*ns*	.007	.08
	Authoritarianism				
Ho		0.92	*ns*	.011	.11
Cynicism		0.52	*ns*	.006	.08
Hostile Attributions		2.22	*ns*	.026	.16
Hostile Affect		1.62	*ns*	.019	.14
Aggressive Responding		0.64	*ns*	.008	.09
	Authoritativeness				
Ho		3.99	<.05	.046	-.21
Cynicism		3.66	<.06	.042	-.21
Hostile Attributions		1.71	*ns*	.020	-.14
Hostile Affect		1.38	*ns*	.016	-.13
Aggressive Responding		4.16	<.05	.048	-.22

Table 2

Summary of Simple Regressions for Fathers' Data of Nurturance, Permissiveness, Authoritarianism, and Authoritativeness on Ho and the Ho Subset Factors

Independent variables	Dependent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	r^2	r
	Nurturance				
Ho		2.58	*ns*	.030	-.17
Cynicism		11.49	<.001	.122	-.35
Hostile Attributions		0.68	*ns*	.008	-.09
Hostile Affect		0.08	*ns*	.001	.03
Aggressive Responding		2.12	*ns*	.025	-.16
	Permissiveness				
Ho		3.21	<.08	.037	-.19
Cynicism		4.42	<.04	.051	-.23
Hostile Attributions		7.64	<.007	.084	-.29
Hostile Affect		0.24	*ns*	.003	.05
Aggressive Responding		0.81	*ns*	.010	.10
	Authoritarianism				
Ho		5.16	<.03	.059	.24
Cynicism		5.40	<.03	.061	.25
Hostile Attributions		7.67	<.007	.085	.29
Hostile Affect		0.05	*ns*	.001	-.02
Aggressive Responding		0.29	*ns*	.004	.06
	Authoritativeness				
Ho		8.49	<.005	.093	-.31
Cynicism		12.97	<.001	.135	-.37
Hostile Attributions		7.62	<.007	.084	-.29
Hostile Affect		1.56	*ns*	.018	.14
Aggressive Responding		0.85	*ns*	.010	-.10

anism [$F = 5.16$, $p < .03$], and Authoritativeness [$F = 8.49$, $p < .005$]. Furthermore, for the Ho item subsets, Fathers' Cynicism was predictive of Nurturance and each of the three authority variables, and Fathers' Hostile Attributions predicted each of the three measures of authority.

In an effort to determine those Ho and Ho factor scores that best predict parental authority, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were employed. In these analyses, statistically significant Ho subset factors were entered into the regression equations first (and these were entered based upon the strength of the bivariate relationships) and only after each of these was entered did we enter the Ho factor. This order of entry was based upon the findings of Barefoot et al. (1989) that particular subset factor combinations were of greater predictive significance in some contexts than was the total Ho factor. Summaries of these hierarchical regression analyses are presented in Table 3 for the mothers' data and in Table 4 for the fathers' data.

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Mothers' Data of Authoritativeness on Ho Subset Factors and Ho

	Dependent variable		
	Mothers' Authoritativeness		
Independent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	Partial r^2
Aggressive Responding	4.12	<.05	.048
Cynicism	1.28	*ns*	.015
Ho	0.02	*ns*	.000

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Fathers' Data of Permissiveness, Authoritarianism, and Authoritativeness on Ho Subset Factors and Ho

Independent variables	Dependent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	Partial r^2
	Permissiveness			
Hostile Attributions		7.70	<.01	.084
Cynicism		0.91	*ns*	.010
Ho		1.69	*ns*	.019
	Authoritarianism			
Hostile Attributions		7.65	<.01	.085
Cynicism		1.40	*ns*	.016
Ho		0.33	*ns*	.004
	Authoritativeness			
Cynicism		13.08	<.001	.135
Hostile Attributions		1.70	*ns*	.018
Ho		1.02	*ns*	.011

Mothers' Aggressive Responding explained nearly 5% ($F = 4.12$, $p < .05$) of Mothers' Authoritativeness. Neither Mothers' Cynicism nor Mothers' Ho added significantly to this prediction of Mothers' Authoritativeness. For the fathers' data (Table 4), the factor of Hostile Attributions was associated with 8.4% ($F = 7.70$, $p < .01$) of the variance in Permissiveness and 8.5% ($F = 7.65$, $p < .01$) of the variance in Authoritarianism; neither Cynicism nor Ho significantly augmented these r^2 values. For Fathers' Authoritativeness, 13.5% ($F = 13.08$, $p < .001$) of the variance was explained by Fathers' Cynicism, and neither Fathers' Hostile Attributions nor Fathers' Ho were associated with a significant increase in the proportion of variance accounted for.

A third hypothesis proposed an inverse relation between parental Ho and adolescent self-esteem. Simple regression analyses were used to test this hypothesis as well as to determine the ability of the Ho subset factors to predict self-esteem. Summaries of these analyses are presented in Table 5. For the mothers' data, self-esteem was predicted by Cynicism ($F = 5.33$, $p < .03$) and Hostile Attributions ($F = 4.75$, $p < .04$); for the fathers' data, self-esteem was predicted by Cynicism ($F = 21.19$, $p < .0001$), Ho ($F = 7.83$, $p < .007$), and Hostile Attributions ($F = 5.85$, $p < .02$).

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to determine the proportion of variance in self-esteem associated with significant Ho factors. In these analyses, statistically significant Ho subset factors were entered into the regression equations first (order of entry was based upon the strength of the bivariate relationships), followed by Ho. Furthermore, the interaction of Mothers' Ho and Fathers' Ho was entered after each of these variables had been entered into the regression model. These analyses are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5

Summary of Simple Regression Analyses of Self-Esteem on Ho and the Ho Subset Factors

	Dependent variable			
	Self-esteem			
Independent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	r^2	r
Mothers' Ho	2.42	*ns*	.028	-.17
Mothers' Cynicism	5.33	<.03	.060	-.25
Mothers' Hostile Attributions	4.75	<.04	.054	-.23
Mothers' Hostile Affect	2.63	*ns*	.031	-.18
Mothers' Aggressive Responding	0.11	*ns*	.001	-.04
Fathers' Ho	7.83	<.007	.086	-.29
Fathers' Cynicism	21.19	<.0001	.203	-.45
Fathers' Hostile Attributions	5.85	<.02	.066	-.26
Fathers' Hostile Affect	0.86	*ns*	.010	.10
Fathers' Aggressive Responding	0.49	*ns*	.006	.08

Of the Ho factors, only Fathers' Cynicism and Fathers' Ho predicted significant proportions of the variance in self-esteem; together these two variables were associated with 25.8% of the self-esteem variance. Furthermore, the interaction of Mothers' Ho and Fathers' Ho failed to significantly augment this R^2 value.

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses of Self-Esteem on the Ho Subset Factors and Ho

	Dependent variable		
	Self-esteem		
Independent variables	$F(1,83)$	p	Partial r^2
Fathers' Cynicism	21.76	<.0001	.203
Fathers' Hostile Attributions	0.27	*ns*	.002
Mothers' Cynicism	0.06	*ns*	.001
Mothers' Hostile Attributions	0.04	*ns*	.000
Fathers' Ho	5.87	<.05	.055
Mothers' Ho x Fathers' Ho	0.47	*ns*	.004

Discussion

As can be seen in Table 1, the mothers' Ho and Ho subset factors were not significantly related to Mothers' Nurturance, Permissiveness, or Authoritarianism. These Ho variables were predictive only in the case of Mothers' Authoritativeness, and the hierarchical regression analyses summarized in Table 3 revealed that once Mothers' Aggressive Responding was entered into the regression model, Ho and the remaining Ho subset factors failed to augment r^2. Thus Ho and its subset factors do not appear to be strong predictor variables for mothers' nurturance and authority patterns in the family.

For the fathers' hostility, however (Tables 2 and 4), several relationships emerged. Fathers' Cynicism was strongly predictive of adolescents' assessments of (a) Fathers' Nurturance (F = 11.49, $p < .001$), accounting for 12% of the variance, as well as (b) Fathers' Authoritativeness (F 13.08, $p < .001$, r^2 = 14%). Furthermore, the Fathers' Hostile Attributions factor was associated with 8% of the variance in Fathers' Permissiveness (F = 7.70, $p < .01$) and 9% of the variance in Fathers' Authoritarianism (F = 7.65, $p < .01$).

These results in the present study seem to suggest that the Ho construct actually manifests itself differently for men than for women. Such results are consistent with the findings of Smith et al. (1990), who reported that in a marriage context Ho was much more predictive of overt indices of hostility for men than for women. They found that high Ho men were more apt to respond to situations of interpersonal conflict with anger, blame, and hostile behavior than were low Ho men. For the women, however, differences between high Ho and low Ho individuals in these conflict situations were apparent only in the case of hostile behavior. Thus the psychological disposition of Ho appears

to affect the overt behavioral and emotional expressions of men more than those of women. Similarly in the present study, adolescents' appraisals of mothers' and fathers' nurturance and authority were more strongly related to Ho variables in the fathers than in the mothers, thus suggesting that these Ho gender differences extend to the context of parenting.

A more detailed understanding of the present findings may be ascertained through a further discussion of the relationships of Barefoot et al.'s (1989) Ho subset factors to the adolescent appraisals of parental nurturance and authority. For the mothers, only Aggressive Responding was predictive of any of the nurturance or authority variables, and then only for Authoritativeness. The Aggressive Responding factor consists of items such as the following: "When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing," and "I do not try to cover up my poor opinion or pity of a person so that he won't know how I feel." Thus those mothers who agreed with these types of statements had adolescents who tended to view their exercise of authority as less reasoned and flexible (characteristics of authoritative parenting). It is interesting to note here that Smith et al. (1990) reported that only Hostile Behavior (defined as any communication which included expressions of criticism, opposition, antagonism, and the like) differentiated high Ho women from low Ho women in situations of marital conflict. The similarity of the Aggressive Responding construct to that of Hostile Behavior, and the similarity of the present results to those of Smith et al. suggest that (a) Ho in women is generally not predictive of overt interpersonal expressiveness, and that (b) when Ho is predictive of overt expressions, it is the antagonistic responding of high Ho women versus

low Ho women that is the discriminating dimension of the Ho disposition.

For the fathers, Cynicism was strongly predictive of Nurturance and Authoritativeness. This Cynicism factor is measured by items such as the following: "I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others," and "Most people make friends because friends will be useful to them." When fathers agreed with these types of statements, their adolescent children tended to assess them as less nurturant and less authoritative, thus suggesting that these dispositions of cynical hostility in the fathers tend to be overtly expressed and that they are subsequently employed by adolescents in their appraisals of Nurturance and Authoritativeness. Similarly, the Hostile Attributions factor was related to assessments of Permissiveness and Authoritarianism. Examples of Hostile Attribution items are: "I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me," and "My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others." Those fathers who were high in Hostile Attributions were evaluated as low in Permissiveness and high in Authoritarianism. Again, these internal dispositions in the fathers (but not in the mothers) apparently lead to behavioral and emotional expressions that are important in adolescent evaluations of authority.

Subsequent analyses in the present study in which adolescent self-esteem was regressed on the statistically-significant Ho variables further confirmed the differential effects of the Ho disposition in men and women. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that 26% [$F(2,82) = 12.17$, $p < .0001$] of the variance in self-esteem was associated with the factors of Fathers' Cynicism and Fathers' Ho; the mothers' Ho variables failed to significantly increase

this R^2 value. Furthermore, contrary to our initial hypothesizing, the interaction of Mothers' Ho and Fathers' Ho did not augment this R^2 value. These findings suggest that when fathers have a disposition of cynical hostility, they tend to interact with their children in such a way that discourages self-confidence and self-worth. As stated by Barefoot et al. (1989), "Cynicism items reflect a generally negative view of humankind, depicting others as unworthy, deceitful, and selfish" (p. 48). The present findings suggest that this view clearly gets expressed in fathers' interactions with their children.

References

Bachman, J. G. (1982). Family relationships and self-esteem. In M. Rosenberg & H. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Social psychology of the self-concept* (pp. 356-362). Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.

Barefoot, J. C., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Williams, R. B. (1983). Hostility, CHD incidence, and total mortality: A 25-year follow-up study of 255 physicians. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 45,* 59-63.

Barefoot, J. C., Dodge, K. A., Peterson, B. L., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Williams, R. B. (1989). The Cook-Medley Hostility Scale: Item content and ability to predict survival. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 51,* 46-57.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4*(2, Pt. 2).

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In L. Petrullo & B. M. Bass (Eds.), *Leadership and interpersonal behavior* (pp. 239-271). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 57,* 110-119.

Buri, J. R. (1989). Self-esteem and appraisals of parental behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 4,* 33-49.

Buri, J. R., Kirchner, P. A., & Walsh, J. M. (1987). Familial correlates of self-esteem in young American adults. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127,* 583-588.

Buri, J. R., Louiselle, P. A., Misukanis, T. M., & Mueller, R. A. (1988). Effects of parental authoritarianism and authoritativeness on self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14,* 271-282.

Cook, W. W., & Medley, D. M. (1954). Proposed hostility and pharisaic-virtue scores for the MMPI. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 38,* 414-418.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem.* San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16,* 297-334.

Fitts, W. (1965). *Tennessee self-concept scale.* Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Gecas, V. (1971). Parental behavior and dimensions of adolescent self-evaluation. *Sociometry, 34,* 466-482.

Gecas, V. (1969). *Parent-child interaction and adolescent self-evaluation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Gecas, V., & Schwalbe, M. L. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48,* 37-46.

Hardy, J. D., & Smith, T. W. (1988). Cynical hostility and vulnerability to disease: Social support, life stress, and physiological response to conflict. *Health Psychology, 7*, 447-459.

Hoelter, J., & Harper, L. (1987). Structural and interpersonal family influences on adolescent self-conception. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49*, 129-139.

Maccoby, E. E. (1980). *Social development: Psychological growth and the parent-child relationship*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Martin, B. (1975). Parent-child relations. In F. D. Horowitz (Ed.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 4, pp. 463-540). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peterson, G. W., Southworth, L. E., & Peters, D. F. (1983). Children's self-esteem and maternal behavior in three low-income samples. *Psychological Reports, 52*, 79-86.

Reid, J. B., & Patterson, G. R. (1984). Social interactional processes within the family: The study of the moment-by-moment family transactions in which human social development is imbedded. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 5*, 237-262.

Rohner, R. P. (1986). *The warmth dimension*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rollins, B. C., & Thomas, D. L. (1979). Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family: Research-based theories* (Vol. 1, pp. 317-364). New York: Free Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.

Schaefer, E., & Bell, R. (1958). Development of a parental attitude research instrument. *Child Development, 29,* 339-361.

Sears, R. R. (1970). Relation of early socialization experience to self-concepts and gender roles in middle childhood. *Child Development, 41,* 267-289.

Shekelle, R. B., Gale, M., Ostfeld, A. M., & Paul, O. (1983). Hostility, risk of coronary heart disease, and mortality. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 45,* 109-114.

Smith, T. W., & Allred, K. D. (1989). Blood pressure responses during social interaction in high and low cynically hostile males. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 12,* 135-143.

Smith, T. W., & Frohm, K. D. (1985). What's so unhealthy about hostility?: Construct validity and psychosocial correlates of the Cook and Medley Ho scale. *Health Psychology, 4,* 503-520.

Smith, T. W., Sanders, J. D., & Alexander, J. F. (1990). What does the Cook and Medley hostility scale measure? Affect, behavior, and attributions in the marital context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 699-708.

Straus, M., & Brown, B. (1978). *Family measurement techniques: Abstracts of published instruments, 1934-1974 (rev. ed.).* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Suarez, E. C., & Williams, R. B. (1989). Situational determinants of cardiovascular and emotional reactivity in high and low hostile men. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 51,* 404-418.

Williams, R. B., Jr., Haney, T. L., Lee, K. L., Kong, Y., Blumenthal, J., & Whalen, R. (1980). Type A behavior, hostility, and coronary atherosclerosis. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *42*, 539-549.